



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/715,095

11/17/2003

Olli Oksanen

042933/269772

3257

826

7590

08/29/2007

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

SHRESTHA, KIRAN K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/715,095

Applicant(s)

OKSANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Kiran K. Shrestha

Art Unit

2173

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27 and 29.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Continued to the next page.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on August 21, 2007. The amendment cancelled claims 2, 6, 26 and 28 and amended 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27 and 29. Thus, claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27 and 29 are currently pending and have been considered below.
2. Applicant's arguments filed on August 21, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the prior art does not teach or suggest "to automatically alter the speed of the browsing using the media handle when a media file having the chosen browse parameter is approached or in the media view".

In contrast to the applicant's argument, Yang does teach automatically start showing the images one by one at certain time intervals with some smooth transition between the two images. The image will last on the screen for some predefined and user configurable time period. User can stop at a certain image by pressing STOP button and then can start the slide show using AUTOPLAY button (which is substantially similar to media handle; column 23, lines 12-19).

The applicant also argues that the prior art does not teach or suggest "to automatically alter the speed of the browsing when the processing unit determines that a media file is approaching or currently in the media view."

In contrast to the applicant's argument, Yang does teach automatically start showing the images one by one at certain time intervals with some smooth transition between the two images. The image will last on the screen for some predefined and user configurable time period. User can stop at a certain image by pressing STOP button and then can start the slide show using AUTOPLAY button (column 23, lines 12-19) and user configurable options set the time interval between two images i.e. applicable to AUTOMATIC mode (Column 23, lines 20-35).

The applicant also argues that the prior art does not teach or suggest "instructions for decreasing the speed of the browsing in relation to the distance of the approaching media file and extent of a deviation of the media handle from a centerline position.

In contrast to the applicant's argument, Yang does teach automatically start showing the images one by one at certain time intervals (which is substantially similar to browsing in relation to the distance) with some smooth transition between the two images. The image will last on the screen for some predefined and user configurable time period. User can stop at a certain image by pressing STOP button and then can start the slide show using AUTOPLAY button (which is substantially similar to media handle; column 23, lines 12-19).

The applicant also argues that the prior art does not teach or suggest "increasing the speed of browsing when a media file, in accordance with the chosen browser parameter, bypasses a centerline position of a view generated by the computer program product".

In contrast to the applicant's argument, Yang does teach automatically start showing the images one by one at certain time intervals (which is substantially similar to faster or slower speed) with some smooth transition between the two images. The image will last on the screen for some predefined and user configurable time period (column 23, lines 12-17).


TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER